

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1-4 and 9-14 are pending in the application. No claims have been amended. Claims 9-15 have been added. Claims 5-8 have been canceled.

The Examiner rejected claims 5-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 1.75(c) as being improper form because a multiple dependent claims 1-4. The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5-8 have been canceled, and submits that the objections under 35 U.S.C. § 1.75(c) has been overcome.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kool (U.S. 6,833,329). Claim 1 requires that the final composition of the hexafluorosilicic acid and phosphoric acid is obtained by mixing an aqueous solution of hexafluorosilicic acid at about 34% in a quantity varying from 46% to 86% by volume with an aqueous solution of phosphoric acid at about 75% in a quantity varying from 19% to 49% by volume. Kool does not disclose at least this limitation of the claim.

Kool is directed to a method for selectively removing one or more coatings from the surface of a metal substrate (e.g., a superalloy component of a gas turbine engine). See Kool, Abstract, and col. 1, lines 7-18. Although Kool discloses the step of contacting the coating with an aqueous composition, Kool discloses that the aqueous composition comprises the compound H_2SiF_6 , also referred to as hexafluorosilicic acid, having a range of about 0.2 M to about 2.2 M (where M represents molarity), and an additional acid, such as phosphorous acid, having a range of about .1 M to about 20 M. See Kool, col. 2, lines 1-8, 10-15, and col. 3, lines 4-14, and 51-58. Nothing in Kool describes mixing about 34% in quantity of hexafluorosilicic acid varying from 46% to 86% by volume with about 75% of phosphoric acid in a quantity varying from 19% to

49% by volume, as required by the claim. Given that the cited reference fails to disclose all of the limitations of the claim, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

Given that claim 2 depends from independent claim 1, which is patentable over the cited reference, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claim 2 is also patentable over the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

For similar reasons set forth with respect to claim 1, independent claim 3 is patentable over the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn. Given that claim 4 depends from independent claim 3, which is patentable over the cited reference, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claim 4 is also patentable over the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn. Applicant submits that claims 1-4 are now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

For similar reasons set forth with respect to claim 1, independent claim 9 is patentable over the cited reference. Given that claims 10-14 depend from independent claim 9, which is patentable over the cited reference, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 10-14 are also patentable over the cited reference. Applicant submits that claims 9-14 are now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION


Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the objections and rejections to the claims have been overcome by the amendments and the remarks and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 6/12/07

By: 
Michael J. Mallie
Reg. No. 36,591

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300